Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawings include changes to Fig. 2. This sheet replaces any prior sheet including Fig. 2. In Fig. 2, previously omitted element line connecting elements 335 and 350 has been added. No new matter has been added by the foregoing revision.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet Fig. 2

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 16, 18, 22, 27, 28, 31 and 33-35 are independent claims. Claims 34 and 35 are added by this Amendment.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to because reference elements 335 and 350 contained in FIG. 2 are not connected. In the present Amendment, Applicant has filed a replacement FIG. 2 that shows the interconnection between elements 335 and 350. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Initially, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 8-15 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. In view of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are allowable in their present form.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Lau

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Lau (US 6,690,657). Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Lau is directed to a multi-channel distributed wireless repeater network. The repeater network of Lau is a "plug and play" network wherein low-powered repeaters are distributed throughout a desired coverage area, and each repeater receives a signal from a transmitter, or a re-transmitted signal from another repeater, channel-shifts the received signal to another channel and rebroadcasts the channel-shifted signal (See Column 4, lines 6-40 of Lau). Thus, the

coverage area is inundated with the original transmission at different channels throughout the coverage area. Lau avoids the expected interference problems of such a distributed network by configuring each repeater to be relatively weak (See Column 4, lines 5-9 of Lau).

Independent claim 27, as presently amended, recites "the wireless coverage extension device including an indicator for providing visual indication when received signal levels from at least one of the station devices are sufficient for communication between at least one of the first and second wireless station devices and the wireless coverage extension device". The Examiner reads claim 27 upon FIG. 15, particularly power detector 168, control circuit 166, control link 170 and a base station (not shown in FIG. 15) (See Pages 3-4 of the Office Action). The control circuit 166 maintains a communication link ("control link 166") with the base station (See Column 8, lines 51-53 of Lau). The base station configures the receive and transmit channels for each repeater in the network based on information provided via the control link 170. The control circuit 166 reports channel power received at each test point (i.e., each receiver), and the base station configures the receive/transmit channels of the repeaters based on this information (See Column 9, lines 2-6).

In an example, claim 27 as presently amended reads on the Specification at Paragraph [0033] of the Specification (e.g., "*Feedback to a user can be controlled by the microprocessor 385 via an indicator 390 which could be, but is not limited to, a series of light emitting diodes. Feedback to the user could be an indication that the wireless repeater 200 is in an acceptable location such that either or both frequencies from the wireless access point 100 and the client device 105 can be detected, or that power is supplied to the wireless repeater 200.*").

As will now be explained, Applicant submits that Lau is silent regarding visual feedback related to when signal levels at a given location are sufficient to support communication.

First, in Lau, the control circuit 166 reports channel power measured at one or more repeaters in the network via control link 170 (e.g., see Column 9, lines 2-6 of Lau). However, this power measurement report is not an indication related to whether signal strength is sufficient for communication. For example, if no signals related to communication are present, the control circuit 166 would still report the measured channel power (i.e., in this case, the measured interference) so that the base station can determine the channels to assign to that repeater for future communication. The point of the measured channel power reporting is for the base station to determine which channels (e.g., CH1, CH2, etc.) have interference, and the base station will then presumably select channels without much interference to assign to that repeater. Indeed, Lau states "[c]ontrol link 170 ... can be used by the base station to schedule when a repeater should scan receive channels for interference sources" (See Column 8, lines 63-66 of Lau). Again, this scan could be performed even before any communication signals (other than noise) are even received at the repeater, and as such this scan cannot be said to be indicative of when received signal levels are sufficient for communication.

The closest Lau comes to this claim language is with regard to an alternative embodiment where Lau states "[a]nother way is to have the control circuit scan CH1 and CH2 for a signal having enough power to warrant repeating, and then repeat that signal" (see Column 8, lines 23-26 of Lau). However, Lau provides no guidance as to when a signal would "warrant repeating", or whether this would correspond to the threshold at which communication is possible. In any case, Lau does not disclose *reporting* or indicating this threshold to the base station; rather, only the measured power level if disclosed as being reported to the base station.

Second, Lau only discloses reporting the measured power level to the base station, and discloses nothing related to providing a visual feedback (e.g., See Column 9, lines 2-6 of Lau).

As such, Lau as applied by the Examiner cannot disclose or suggest "the wireless coverage extension device including an indicator for providing visual indication when received signal levels from at least one of the station devices are sufficient for communication between at least one of the first and second wireless station devices and the wireless coverage extension device" as recited in independent claim 27.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of Mizumoto

Claims 1-4, 6 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Lau in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,299 ("Mizumoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Discussion of Lau's Deficiencies

FIGS. 4 and 5 of Lau illustrates repeaters 68 and 78, and a number of transmit/receive (T/R) modules 62, 64, 70, 74 and 80. With regard to the functionality of repeaters 68 and 78, Lau states the following:

> Repeaters 68 and 78 have a single task to perform: they receive signals on a first channel (CH1) and retransmit these signals on a second channel (CH2).
> *(Column 5, lines 32-33 of Lau)*

Thus, repeaters 68 and 78 receive signals on one particular channel, and re-transmit those received signals on another particular channel. The repeaters 68 and 78 are not configured to receive signals on "at least two bi-directional communication frequencies simultaneously" as recited in independent claim 1, for example. Rather, as discussed above, each of repeaters 68 and 78 tune **only** to one channel. Further, the Examiner reads the "receiver" upon antenna 142

and duplexer 144 of FIG. 15, and refers to Column 8, lines 32-33. This section of Lau states "[r]epeater 140 incorporates an antenna 142 coupled to a duplexer 144 that allows simultaneous transmit and receive" (Column 8, lines 32-33).

Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that Lau cannot disclose or suggest "a receiver capable of receiving signals on said at least two bi-directional communication frequencies simultaneously" as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 16 and 18, but rather simply discloses that the repeater can simultaneously receive and transmit on different channels (i.e., not receive on both channels) (e.g., see Page 12 of the Office Action). However, the Examiner alleges that Mizumoto discloses this particular deficiency of Lau.

Discussion of Mizumoto

Mizumoto is directed to a mobile station that can communicate with two different systems that operate in different frequency bands, or channels. The background of Mizumoto discusses two frequency bands A and B are associated with different communication systems (e.g., see Col. 1, lines 19-23 of Mizumoto). The mobile station receives transmissions in band A from the first system, and transmits transmissions in band A to the first system (e.g., see Col. 1, lines 23-35 and Col 1., line 62 to Col. 2, line 10 of Mizumoto), and likewise receives transmissions in band B from the second system, and transmits transmissions in band B to the second system (e.g., see Col. 1, lines 36-43 and Col. 2, lines 15-18 of Mizumoto). Mizumoto's detailed description describes a power-saving feature that converts the signals in bands A and B to an intermediate frequency band.

The Examiner appears to be correct that Mizumoto discloses reception of signals simultaneously at two different frequencies at a mobile station. However, Applicant submits that

Mizumoto's teachings are incompatible with the teachings of Lau, which will now be explained in detail.

Incorporating Mizumoto into Lau's system would not result in Applicant's claimed invention

As discussed above briefly, Lau teaches positioning low-power repeaters throughout a wireless communications system, where each low-powered repeater receives signals on a first channel, and repeats the signals on a second channel. This allegedly provides the following advantages:

> First, in a localized wireless network, lower power and shorter range can be desirable attributes, as they decrease harmful interference with neighbors and unintended recipients, increase security and isolation, and allow for smaller, simpler transceiver designs
>
> *(See Col. 3, line 65 of Lau to Col. 4, line 3 of Lau)*

This decrease in interference, and increase in isolation, is obtained in part by virtue of the channel shifting in Lau (i.e., by channel shifting to a channel that is known to be un-used for transmission by repeaters in proximity to a given repeater). In other words, the decrease in interference and increase in isolation is obtained because repeaters do not re-transmit on the same channel upon which the signals are received. Lau's solution is designed to overcome the problems associated with repeaters transmitting on the same channel, which require different repeaters to be allocated to different time slots on which to transmit to avoid collisions (e.g., see Col. 2, lines 32-38, and Col. 3, lines 14-29 of Lau).

Applicant submits that even if one of ordinary skill in the art had the motivation to combine Mizumoto with Lau, the result reached would *not* be that of the claimed invention. Independent claim 1 recites "receiving signals on said at least two bi-directional communication frequencies simultaneously", "converting the signal present on one of said bi-directional frequencies to a converted signal on the other of said bi-directional frequencies" and

"transmitting the converted signal *on the other of said bi-directional frequencies*" (Emphasis added). Lau, however, teaches away from transmitting on the same channel on which signals are received.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Mizumoto would not be combined with Lau such that each of the simultaneously received signals would be repeated on the channel of the *other* signal. Mizumoto's mere teaching of simultaneously receiving signals is not sufficient to overcome Lau's clear goal of restricting repeaters from transmitting upon the same channel as one which receives signal.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Lau in view of Mizumoto cannot disclose or suggest "receiving signals on said at least two bi-directional communication frequencies simultaneously", "converting the signal present on one of said bi-directional frequencies to a converted signal on the other of said bi-directional frequencies" and "transmitting the converted signal *on the other of said bi-directional frequencies*" (Emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 16 and 18.

As such, claims 2-4, 6, 17 and 19-21, dependent upon independent claims 1, 16 and 18, respectively, are likewise allowable over Lau at least for the reasons given above with respect to independent claims 1, 16 and 18.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of Mizumoto and in further view of Judd

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Lau in view of Mizumoto and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177401 ("Judd"). Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Initially, Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that Law in view of Mizumoto fails to disclose "said first and second antennas have polarization that are largely orthogonal to one another" (See Page 16 of the Office Action). However, the Examiner alleges that Judd discloses this particular deficiency of Lau and Mizumoto. Judd is directed to a repeater for customer premises. Even assuming for the sake of argument that Judd discloses this particular deficiency of Jin, Applicant respectfully submits that Judd is insufficient to cure the suggestion and disclosure deficiencies of Lau in view of Mizumoto as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 (i.e., Judd as applied does not teach how Lau can be configured to permit transmission on the same channel upon which signal are received and avoid interference). As such, claim 5, dependent upon independent claim 1, is likewise allowable over Lau in view of Mizumoto further in view of Judd at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

Claims 34-35 also allowable over Lau in view of Mizumoto

Further, Applicant directs the Examiner to newly added independent claims 34 and 35, which are similar in some respects to independent claim 1 although drawn to a different statutory category of invention. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of allowance for claims 34 and 35 at least in view of the remarks above given with respect to independent claim 1.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of Mizumoto in further view of 3rd embodiment of Lau

Claim 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Lau in view Mizumoto in further view of a third embodiment of Lau. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that the 3rd embodiment of Lau is insufficient to cure the suggestion and disclosure deficiencies of the 1st embodiment of Lau in view of Mizumoto discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. As such, claim 7, dependent upon independent claim 1, is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency upon independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Jin in view of Mizumoto

Claim 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a Jin (US 6,904,266) in view Mizumoto. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Jin is directed to a wireless enhancer using a switch matrix. Based on a review of Jin, Applicant respectfully submit that Jin fails to disclose or suggest "a repeater capable of communicating between said base unit and said client unit using the time division duplex protocol on one of said at least first or second bi-directional communication frequencies different from that used by said client unit" as recited in independent claim 22.

The Examiner alleges this teaching is in Jin at Col. 5, lines 53-54, which states "[a]nother benefit of using different frequencies at the donor and service antenna is that, as mentioned above, the enhancer can scan the available operating spectrum and determine which frequency band corresponds to a minimum interference, and then use that particular frequency for the link between the enhancer and the terminals/BTSs to ensure signal quality and reduce interference

(e.g., see Col. 5, lines 53-60 of Jin). Clearly, Jin teaches selecting the frequency with the lowest interference. This is not necessarily a frequency that is "different from that used by said client unit" as recited in independent claim 22. Such a selection, in Jin, would be entirely coincidental.

Further, the Examiner cites to Mizumoto to overcome Jin's failure to disclose or suggest bi-directional frequencies. However, even assuming for the sake of argument that Mizumoto has such a teaching, Mizumoto cannot cure Jin's failure to disclose a repeater configured to transmit on a frequency "different from that used by said client unit" as recited in claim 22. Rather, the combination of Jin and Mizumoto would likely continue to simply select the lowest-interference channel on which to transmit, as taught by Jin.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Jin in view of Mizumoto in further view of 2nd embodiment of Jin

Claims 23, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Jin in view of Mizumoto and in further view of a second embodiment of Jin. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

The Examiner cites to the third embodiment of Jin to overcome the failure of the first embodiment of Jin and Mizumoto to disclose certain limitations within claims 23, 24 and 26. However, the third embodiment of Jin still fails to disclose or suggest "a repeater capable of communicating between said base unit and said client unit using the time division duplex protocol on one of said at least first or second bi-directional communication frequencies *different from that used by said client unit*" as recited in independent claim 22 (emphasis added). As such, claims 23, 24 and 26, dependent upon independent claim 22, are likewise allowable over Jin at least by virtue of their dependency upon independent claim 22.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Jin in view of Mizumoto in view of Jin and further in view of Judd

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Jin (US 6904266) in view Mizumoto in view of a second embodiment of Jin and further in view of Judd (US 2002/0177401). Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Initially, Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that 1st embodiment of Jin in view of Mizumoto in view of 2nd embodiment of Jin fails to disclose "wherein the first and second antennas have largely orthogonal polarization" (See Page 25 of the 8/11/2008 Office Action). However, the Examiner alleges that Judd discloses this particular deficiency of Jin and Mizumoto. Judd is directed to a repeater for customer premises (i.e., a residential home). Even assuming for the sake of argument that Judd discloses this particular deficiency of Jin and Mizumoto, Applicant respectfully submits that Judd is insufficient to cure the suggestion and disclosure deficiencies of 1st embodiment of Jin in view Mizumoto in view of 2nd embodiment of Jin as discussed above with respect to independent claim 22. As such, claim 25, dependent upon independent claim 22, is likewise allowable over 1st embodiment of Jin in view of 2nd embodiment of Jin and further in view of Judd at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 22.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of Mizumoto in view of Judd

Claims 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Mizumoto in view of Judd. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

In Lau, the Examiner reads the claimed "wireless coverage extension device" upon repeater 68 of FIG. 4. As discussed above, with regard to the functionality of repeaters 68 and 78, Lau states the following:

> Repeaters 68 and 78 have a single task to perform: they receive signals on a first channel (CH1) and retransmit these signals on a second channel (CH2).
>
> *(Column 5, lines 32-33 of Lau)*

Accordingly, repeater 68 has two uni-directional communication links (i.e., signal reception on CH1, and signal transmission on CH2), ***not*** two bi-directional communication links. A bi-directional communication link means that communication occurs in two directions. Lau is explicit regarding repeater 68 in that repeater 68 *only receives signals* on CH1, and *only transmits signals* on CH2. Accordingly, these links cannot properly be characterized as "bi-directional".

The Examiner admits this deficiency in Lau but cites to Mizumoto as disclosing bi-directional communication links. However, Mizumoto states "[a]n antenna 1 is one that, as shown in FIG. 3, is capable of transmitting and receiving signals in frequency bands (bands A and B) which are allocated to two radiocommunication systems, respectively" (See Col. 4, line 1-4 of Mizumoto). Claim 28 recites "the first bi-directional communication link operating on a first frequency channel *utilizing a first antenna* of a specific polarization, and the second bi-directional communication link operating on a second frequency channel *utilizing a second antenna* with a polarization orthogonal to the first antenna" (Emphasis added).

The fact that Mizumoto teaches using a single antenna to transmit and receive signals in bands A and B teaches away from using multiple antennas to do so as claimed.

Further, the illustration of two (2) antennas in repeater 68 of FIG. 4 of Lau is misleading and Applicant does not believe this illustration is intended by Lau to imply that two physical antennas are included, but rather to distinguish between functionality provided by a single antenna (e.g., see FIG. 4 of Lau and description thereof). This appears to be a functional illustration, and not an illustration of structure meant to be taken literally. This is supported by the more detailed repeater diagrams of FIGS. 14-17. For example, in FIG. 14, the repeater is shown in more detail, and the repeater 100 of FIG. 14 clearly illustrates a single antenna for receiving *and* transmitting data (e.g., see FIG. 14 of Lau and description thereof). This can also be seen in the repeater examples of FIGS. 15 through 17, which each illustrate a single antenna. This makes sense because the antenna is described as an omni-directional antenna in Lau, which implies transmission in all directions, such that more than one antenna would not appear to be necessary.

The Examiner combines Judd with Lau and Mizumoto merely to compensate for Lau's failure to disclose "orthogonal antennas". However, even if the Examiner is correct regarding the teachings of Judd, Applicant submits that Judd fails to cure the suggestion and disclosure deficiencies of Lau in view of Mizumoto as discussed above. In particular, while Judd may disclose how to arrange antennas to be orthogonal to each other to avoid interference, Judd does not provide a rationale for why one of ordinary skill in the art would replace the single-antenna teaching of Mizumoto and/or Lau with multiple orthogonal antennas.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Lau in view of Judd cannot disclose or suggest "a wireless coverage extension device" communicating over ""the first bi-directional communication link operating on a first frequency channel *utilizing a first antenna* of a specific polarization, and the second bi-directional communication link operating on a second frequency channel *utilizing a second antenna* with a polarization orthogonal to the first antenna" as recited

in independent claim 28 (Emphasis added). As such, claims 29-30, dependent upon independent claim 28, are likewise allowable over Lau in view Mizumoto in view of Judd at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 28.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of 2nd embodiment of Lau

Claims 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Lau in view a second embodiment of Lau. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Initially, the Examiner refers to "power detector 168" (e.g., see Page 29 of the 8/11/2008 Office Action). While illustrated in FIG. 15 of Lau, power detector 168 is not actually discussed in the text of Lau, so Applicant will presume that power detector 168 operates similar to power detector 132 as illustrated in FIG. 14 of Lau. With respect to power detector 132, Lau states "a power detector 132, which may be as simple as a diode detector, provides an indication of received power to control circuit 130" (e.g., see Col. 8, lines 3-8 of Lau).

By the present Amendment, the "detection function" recited in claim 31 has been clarified as being a "signal detection function". Applicant submits that the power detector 132 does not detect whether a signal is present, but rather simply measures the power on a given channel. Thus, the power detector 132 could actually be measuring interference even when no signals are actually present on the channel. For example, Lau states "[c]ontrol circuit 166 reports to the base station the channel power received at each test point in the sequence, and any interference sources ..." (e.g., see Col. 9, lines 10-24 of Lau).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Lau, as applied, fails to disclose or suggest "a signal detection function" as recited in claim 31. As such, claim 32, dependent upon

independent claim 31, is likewise allowable over Lau at least for the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 31.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Lau in view of 3rd embodiment of Lau in further view of Mizumoto

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a first embodiment of Lau in view a third embodiment of Lau in view of Mizumoto. Applicant respectfully traverses this art grounds of rejection.

Claim 33 recites "the first bi-directional communication link operating on a first frequency channel *utilizing a first directional antenna*, and the second bi-directional communication link operating on a second frequency channel *utilizing a second directional antenna*" (emphasis added).

As discussed above, the illustration of two (2) antennas in repeater 68 of FIG. 4 of Lau is not intended by Lau to imply that two physical antennas are included, but rather to distinguish between the transmitting and receiving functionality of a single antenna (e.g., see FIG. 4 of Lau and description thereof). Thus, this appears to be a functional illustration, and not an illustration of structure meant to be taken literally. This is supported by the more detailed repeater diagrams of FIGS. 14-17. For example, in FIG. 14, the repeater is shown in more detail, and the repeater 100 of FIG. 14 clearly illustrates a single antenna for receiving *and* transmitting data (e.g., see FIG. 14 of Lau and description thereof). This can also be seen in the repeater examples of FIGS. 15 through 17, which each illustrate a single antenna. This makes sense because the antenna is described as an omni-directional antenna, which implies transmission in all directions, such that more than one antenna would not appear to be necessary.

Furthermore, Mizumoto states "[a]n antenna 1 is one that, as shown in FIG. 3, is capable of transmitting and receiving signals in frequency bands (bands A and B) which are allocated to two radiocommunication systems, respectively" (See Col. 4, line 1-4 of Mizumoto). The fact that Mizumoto teaches using a single antenna to transmit and receive signals in bands A and B teaches away from using multiple antennas to do so.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Lau in view of Mizumoto, as applied, fails to disclose or suggest "the first bi-directional communication link operating on a first frequency channel *utilizing a first directional antenna*, and the second bi-directional communication link operating on a second frequency channel *utilizing a second directional antenna*" as recited in independent claim 33 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 12/11/08

By: _____

Linda G. Gunderson, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,341

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 651-7351
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502